





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/049,304	03/27/1998	SAVERIO CARL FALCO	BB-1037-F	5349
7:	590 07/29/2003			٠.
LYNNE M CHRISTENBURY E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL - PATENTS			EXAMINER	
			MCELWAIN, ELIZABETH F	
1007 MARKET WILMINGTOR			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1638	26
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003	• .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/049,304	FALCO ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Elizabeth F. McElwain	1,000
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the co	correspondence address
A SH THE   - External filter - If the   - Failur - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we preserve the period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH( 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	(S) FROM  nely filed  s will be considered timely.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 M	<u>lay 2003</u> .	
2a)⊠	This said to be a second	s action is non-final.	
3)□ Disp sitio	Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under E on of Claims	non overal factor in the	osecution as to the ments is 53 O.G. 213.
	Claim(s) $4-20$ is/are pending in the application.	•	
4	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8-10,12 and 16-20</u> is/a	are withdrawn from consideration	L
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•
6)⊠ (	Claim(s) <u>4-7,11 and 13-15</u> is/are rejected.		
7) 🗌 (	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	election requirement.	
9)∐ T	he specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
	he drawing(s) filed on 27 March 1998 is/are: a)[	X accepted or h) Clabinated to be a	L = .
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) he hold in character to by t	ne Examiner.
11)[] TI	he proposed drawing correction filed oni	s: a) approved b) discerses	9 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	to this Office action	ed by the Examiner.
12) 🗌 Ti	ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Exan	niner	
riority un	der 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 25 U.C.O. c.440()	( D )
a) <u></u> □	All b) Some * c) None of:	110/1ty under 35 0.5.C. § 119(a)-	(d)*or (f).
	. Certified copies of the priority documents h	19va haan raasii sad	
2.	Certified copies of the priority documents h	ave been received.	
3.	Copies of the certified copies of the priority	decuments be an Application	No
* See	Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea the attached detailed Office action for a list of	the certified copies not received	
14)  Ack	mowledgment is made of a claim for domestic p	riority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e)	to a provisional application)
4 <i>)</i> L	nowledgment is made of a claim for domestic p	ional application has been been	
<u> </u>		_	
	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) On Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	4) Interview Summary (P 5) Notice of Informal Pate 6) Other:	TO-413) Paper No(s) int Application (PTO-152)
atent and Traden -326 (Rev. 0	nark Office 4-01) Office Action	Cummon	

Serial No. 09/049,304

Art Unit 1638

The amendments filed December 17, 2002 and May 6, 2003 have been entered.

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled.

Claims 4-7, 11, and 14 have been amended.

Claims 4-20 are pending.

5

This application contains claims 8, 10 and 16-20 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 18. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01. In addition, claims 9 and 12 are drawn to an invention non-elected by original presentation and must also be cancelled in response to the final rejection.

10

Claims 4-7, 11 and 13-15 are examined.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 6 is objected to for the recitation of "increase" which should read "increased".

15

20

Claims 7, and claims 11 and 13-15 dependent thereon, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 7 is indefinite in the recitation of "or a part" with regard to the nucleic acid sequence, since a part can be as little as one nucleotide.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, as stated in the last office action. In addition, a nucleic acid fragment that would hybridize under the claimed conditions and would increase lysine content is not described structurally or with any specific function. Any protein comprising a lysine residue could, potentially, increase lysine content in a plant cell.

Applicants' arguments filed December 17, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants assert that the rejection should be withdrawn given that the specification discloses that the claimed sequences are partial sequences of corn LKR/SDH. In addition, applicants have submitted Epelbaum et al that is a reference by the inventors that discloses an Arabidopsis LKR/SDH sequence. Applicants have also submitted Kemper et al that assesses the structure/function of corn LKR/SDH, but does not provide a nucleotide or amino acid sequence. Applicants argue that a correlation between structure and function has been provided.

The Examiner maintains that applicants' arguments do not relate to the claims, which are drawn to SEQ ID NO: 120 and 122. Applicants have not made a correlation between the teachings of the cited references and claimed sequences.

5

10

15

Claims 4-7, 11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, as stated in the last office action.

5

Applicants' arguments and the Declaration of Falco filed December 17, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants assert that the rejection should be withdrawn given that Tang et al teach an Arabidopsis cDNA encoding a bifunctional LKR/SDH, and state that SEQ ID NO: 111 is indentical to the sequence taught by Tang et al. In addition, applicants argue that the Declaration of Falco demonstrates knocking out LKR/SDH leads to increased lysine accumulation, and a second declaration dated February 16, 2001 demonstrates seeds with increased lysine obtained from plants co-transformed with DHPS and LKR. Therefore, applicants argue that a correlation between sequence similarity and functionality has been established with regard to LKR/SDH.

15

10

The Examiner maintains that applicants' arguments do not relate to the claims, which are drawn to SEQ ID NO: 120 and 122. Applicants have not made a correlation between the teachings of the cited reference or the Declarations of Falco and claimed sequences.

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth F. McElwain whose telephone number is (703) 308-1794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amy Nelson, can be reached at (703) 306-3218. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4242. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the legal analyst, Gwendolyn Payne, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2475, or to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Elizabeth F. McElwain, Ph.D. July 25, 2003

ELIZABETH F. MCELWAIN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1800

25

5

10

15

20